

RECEIVED

JAN 27 2000

EIS001058

Comment on the Department of Energy's Yucca Mountain Draft Environmental Impact Statement

I agree with the following statements which I have checked:

	Check Below	
1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The No Action Alternatives are not reasonable. The EIS should have a reasonable no action alternative.
2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The EIS is inadequate because it uses outdated 1990 census data rather than current population data for Nevada.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The analysis of transportation impacts in Nevada is insufficient for making modal, corridor and route decisions.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The floodplain analysis is insufficient for corridor and route selection
3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The impact of stigma on tourism, recreation and agriculture based economies in Nevada should be analyzed.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The EIS should analyze the impacts of a crash between a military airplane and a nuclear waste rail car.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other - see below

Comment:

The Department of Energy's Yucca Mountain Draft Environmental Impact Statement includes an option to construct a rail line from Beowawe to Yucca Mountain through Crescent Valley to transport nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain. DOE is required to consider all comments submitted regarding the impacts of building and operating a repository including transportation.

My comments for the record are:

- 4 Safety concerns, especially groundfault and earthquake issues, are of great concern and make this area geologically unstable in the long term; storage of nuclear wastes in an area subject to ground shifting is imprudent.

Sh. Star

01/21/2000

kep@tcrad.com.